

# **SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD**

## **MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

January 25 & 26, 2001

Natural Resources Building  
Olympia, Washington

---

### ***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
John Roskelley	Spokane
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jeff Koenings	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife (arrived at 12:05 p.m.)
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Gerry O'Keefe	Designee, Department of Ecology (arrived at 11:00 a.m.)

---

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting opened by Chair at 8:20 a.m.

The Chair complimented the lead entity representatives for the good work they have done and thanked the Technical Panel for hard work in meeting with all the different groups.

### **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Approved the agenda as presented.

### **MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS**

#### ***Legislative Update:***

Jim Fox gave a quick update on bills of interest to the SRFB. The two Senate bills (SB5246 and SB5245) requested by the SRFB were heard yesterday, January 24, 2001. A few concerns were voiced about SB5245. HB 1016 provides lead entities with funding for enhanced activities. SB5022 requires SRFB members to file a financial affairs statement with the PDC. Jim will keep the Board posted on these bills.

Discussed HB1016 and how it would affect the lead entities as well as the Board.

Laura Johnson noted that she and Jim have made several presentations to the legislature concerning the SRFB. She also encouraged Board members to contact Jim or Laura if they will be in Olympia and have time to meet with different legislators.



### *Budget Update:*

Director Johnson highlighted the budget status. There is \$34 million available for the rest of this biennium and the Board will need to decide how much it would like to set aside for special projects such as nearshore, monitoring, regionalization, etc. The funds are primarily Federal and in many instances have different requirements, such as ESA consultation.

Brenda McMurray asked if the Board is coordinating our monitoring efforts with the Independent Science Panel's (ISP) report. Director Johnson said this would be discussed during the meeting tomorrow.

Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee (JLARC) just released an environmental agency audit. One recommendation in this report is that the agencies that provide grants will need to improve reporting on what the funds are accomplishing. SRFB's budget request includes \$500,000 to facilitate development of a monitoring program.

### **LEAG UPDATE**

Jay Watson, Hood Canal Coordinating Council and LEAG designee, presented the update.

Jay reported on three issues:

- Chantel Stevens, People for Salmon, came to the LEAG meeting and agreed that before she takes the People for Salmon request to the SRFB, she will talk to more lead entities to see what lead entities need. She will then develop a more comprehensive report (volunteer strategy) and bring it back to the LEAG. If the LEAG approves this report, People for Salmon will bring it to the SRFB to request funding.
- The LEAG has developed a white paper that breaks out functions of lead entities' core activities and enhanced functions. Jay handed out a synopsis of the report and activities.
- HB 1016 closely articulates the core functions and the enhanced functions outlined in the white paper although there are a few differences that the LEAG is hoping to correct through working with Representative Pennington. (Changing the bill to mirror the white paper.)

Larry Cassidy: NWPPC is in negotiations with the BPA on a subbasin planning process. They would like a bottom up process. Is wondering if the lead entities are able to do this within the timeframe they will need. Response: It will depend on the individual lead entity and that the NWPPC and BPA should work with the lead entities in the area they are talking about.

Mr. Watson wanted to make sure the Board didn't think the lead entities only want more money. They want to be able to perform the enhanced activities; there may be more creative ways of doing this such as transferring WDFW staff duties.



## **GSRO REPORT**

Chair Ruckelshaus reviewed the GSRO written report noting that Chris Drivdahl was available to answer questions. (See notebook for details.)

## **SECOND ROUND GRANT APPLICATIONS**

### ***Staff Report:***

Jim Kramer gave an overview of the process that started early last summer, presenting a synopsis of the Technical Panel Evaluation of Lead Entity Project Lists and Staff Analysis Report. (See notebook for full document.)

In the Report two different approaches for the Board's funding decisions are set out. Approach 1 is based on the lead entity list priorities, informed by the Panel's comments, and reflects logical "break points" in level of benefit for each lead entity list. Approach 2 is based on the Technical Panel's rating. This would fund projects that rated 'high' or 'medium' in benefit to salmon and 'high' or 'medium' in certainty. Both approaches remove the projects rating 'low' in benefit to salmon.

### ***Technical Panel Comments:***

Four of the nine Technical Panel members (Carol Smith, Ken Hammond, Paul DeVries, and Brian Allee) were in attendance at the meeting to give their opinions on the process.

Ken Hammond, believes it was very helpful to go to all the lead entity areas of the state to see the issues facing the lead entity groups.

Brian Allee, encouraging to him as a fish biologist at the excitement that the lead entities have on nearshore and estuarine issues. Strategies are very helpful and the lead entities are developing them. NWPPC should integrate watershed subbasin planning with the strategies. Not recommending option 2 but wants the Board to integrate both the Technical Panel and the lead entity list.

Carol Smith, when the Panel was first pulled together they were asked why they wanted to be on the Panel. Unanimously they all wanted to see money spent wisely on salmon projects. She feels they did a good job of highlighting projects that were high in both benefit and certainty and the poor or low benefit projects. Medium rated projects have a wide array of projects; some are closer to 'high' and some are 'low' projects. Would like to add a level of review and ranking on regional importance in upcoming grant cycles.

Paul DeVries, impressed with the caliber of members on the Technical Panel and mutual respect among the members. Being new to the salmon recovery process, he was amazed at how far this process has already progressed in such a short period of time.

Technical Panel has agreed to come together one last time to prepare a report and recommendations to the Board for the next cycle. Need to make sure we don't lose the knowledge this group has gained and that we build on what we have gained.

The Board asked the Panel questions about cost effectiveness, benefits, regional importance, existing assessments and needed assessments, and process.

Panelists commented lead entities need to make sure they explain their overall strategy and steps needed to get to the desired outcome. Need to get to the point where individual projects are articulated in the lead entities' overall strategy.

The GSRO will be releasing its watershed assessment and watershed planning protocols in the next few weeks. Paul DeVries suggested that the Technical Panel review this document. The Chair agreed and noted that the process will need to continue to improve as time goes on.

The Chair noted that there is no clear line between science and policy but a lot of gray area. When you talk about risk, you are talking about both risks to the environment and risk to society. Not strictly science or policy.

The Board then asked the lead entities to offer comments on their lists and the funding options.

### ***Lead Entity Testimony***

#### Whatcom County:

Spokesperson(s): George Boggs and John Thompson

This lead entity submitted a list containing 11 projects requesting a total of \$3,104,841 in SRFB funds.

Supports the first approach. Discussed the regional approach being used in WRIA 1. Appreciated the Panel's meeting with the lead entity and project list review.

Board inquired about: Ownership of Project 1, North Fork Nooksack Recovery; whether or not conditions could be met on Project 5, Acme to Saxon Reach Assessment; and certainty of success and high cost of project 4, Chinook Spawning-Incubation Assessment.

#### Upper Columbia:

Spokesperson(s): Mike Kaputa and Hilary Lyman

This lead entity submitted a list containing 26 projects requesting a total of \$5,130,859 in SRFB funds.

This area integrates the 2514 planning process with the regional salmon recovery process. Very confident with the projects they put forth and support approach 1. Lead entity funding does not fully support the regional effort and they are trying to do too many things with too few resources. 2514 is a cornerstone process. Noted that

projects 3, Collaborative-Integrative Entiat Water and 4, Environmental Assessment of Entiat Sub-Basin could actually have been submitted as one project. Also highlighted projects 12, Entiat River Habitat Acquisition, 13, South Wenatchee Avenue Barrier Removal, and 19, Property Acquisition in Salmon Creek. They clarified which projects the Upper Columbia group has requested funds for; Ms. Lyman noted that they would like to have project 19 funded, the Salmon Creek property acquisition.

Hilary Lyman highlighted project 16, Beaver Creek Fish Passage Barrier. Although there are currently other barriers along the stream, they will all be taken out during this grant cycle. She would like to see project 17, Omak Creek Watershed Restoration, funded and would also like to have the Board consider funding project 19, Property Acquisition in Salmon Creek.

Replying to the question asked earlier by Larry Cassidy, Ms. Lyman does not believe the lead entity is the right group to do the subbasin planning discussed earlier in the day. Regional approach has been a good thing and they will continue to make this process work better.

Larry Cassidy asked what the correct group to work on subbasin planning would be in the upper Columbia area. Mike Kaputa thought Chelan County would be willing to look into doing the subbasin planning but the Okanogan/Douglas County groups don't believe they are the correct group to do this work.

Larry Cassidy inquired about projects 5, Methow Watershed Riparian Habitat Acquisition, and 19, Property Acquisition in Salmon Creek.

John Roskelley inquired about projects 3, Collaborative-Integrative Entiat Water and 16, Beaver Creek Fish Passage Barrier.

Brenda McMurray inquired about project 4, Environmental Assessment of Entiat Sub-Basin's low certainty rating.

Steve Meyer asked Ms. Lyman about the cost of riparian easements.

Thurston County:

Spokesperson(s): No one presented testimony.

This lead entity submitted a list containing 4 projects requesting a total of \$511,750 in SRFB funds.

Snohomish County and Stillaguamish Tribe:

Spokesperson(s): Bob Aldrich

This lead entity submitted a list containing 16 projects requesting a total of \$2,675,233 in SRFB funds.

Mr. Aldrich complimented the Technical Panel and Board. He strongly supports approach 1.

Skagit Watershed Council:

Spokesperson(s): Shirley Solomon, Ben Perkowski, and Carolyn Kelly

This lead entity submitted a list containing 23 projects requesting a total of \$2,856,502 in SRFB funds.

Shirley Solomon supports approach 1. Discussed the social impacts included in the salmon recovery process. Were helped greatly by IAC/SRFB staff and the Review Panel.

Craig Partridge inquired about projects 12, Samish Acquisition and Restoration; 13, Daniels Acquisition and Restoration; and 14, Neff Acquisition and Restoration, asking why the project sponsors went with fee simple versus conservation easements. Carolyn Kelly answered questions concerning these projects.

John Roskelley also inquired about appraisal requirements for the acquisition projects.

Selah/Yakima/Yakama Tribe:

Spokesperson(s): No one presented testimony.

This lead entity submitted a list containing 7 projects requesting a total of \$906,216 in SRFB funds.

San Juan CD:

Spokesperson(s): David Hoopes

This lead entity submitted a list containing 2 projects requesting a total of \$482,982 in SRFB funds.

Supports the Salmon Recovery Funding Board and Technical Review process. Thanked everyone for the hard work. Supports approach 1. Reviewed their projects and reminded the Board that costs are higher on the Islands.

Quinault Nation:

Spokesperson(s): John Sims

This lead entity submitted a list containing 2 projects requesting a total of \$85,500 in SRFB funds.

Discussed the tribal involvement in the salmon recovery efforts around the state. Mr. Sims supports approach 1 since this would get both projects funded and he stressed the importance of these projects. Would like to have federal agencies eligible for funding in the future.

Brenda McMurray asked for clarification on project 1, Lake Quinault Sediment Core Sampling. Mr. Sims replied that this would evaluate whether lake fertilization will be useful or not.

Pierce County:

Spokesperson(s): David Renstrom and Chris Carrell



This lead entity submitted a list containing 14 projects requesting a total of \$4,738,672 in SRFB funds.

Mr. Renstrom pointed out that Technical Panel ranked projects 3, Birch Street Barrier Removal, and 5, West Hylebos Barrier Removal S 364<sup>th</sup>, as 'low' benefit where the lead entity ranked these projects 'high'. High citizen involvement is one of the reasons these projects ranked so high. Pierce County included citizen involvement in its ranking process and would like to have the SRFB also figure out a way to address citizen involvement and interest in the rating and ranking process to help see the benefit in projects such as 3 and 5.

Chris Carrell spoke in support of project 3, Birch Street Barrier Removal and encouraged the Board to fund this project.

Craig Partridge inquired why project 7, White River Pipeline Crossing was presented in the last grant cycle at a much lower cost estimate.

The project sponsor, Glen George, Tacoma Water, responded to Craig's question concerning cost increases to project 7. He noted that they did a geotechnical analysis last year and found an artesian condition that will cause construction problems and the soil make-up is different than originally thought. These two changes cause the increase in cost estimates.

Jerry Alb noted that project 6, Priority Index Surveys - Puyallup Basin, is using the same method priority index (PI) standards that the Department of Transportation uses in project selection. The high ranking of this project encourages him.

Pend Oreille CD:

Spokesperson(s): Steve Roberge and Joe Marohney

This lead entity submitted a list containing 2 projects requesting a total of \$241,993 in SRFB funds.

Supports approach 1. Their group is just getting started and they don't have a limiting factors analysis in their area yet. They used several existing reports to select their projects. They are involved in many processes that are going on in the area for bull trout recovery. Some of the projects in the area are getting funding from the NWPPC.

John Roskelley asked Jeff Koenings where the Board should stand on brook trout eradication. Jeff said that it is within the bull trout recovery plan and he supports this project.

The Chair would like to discuss this in a more generic way tomorrow since approval of this project may affect other species of prey.

Brenda McMurray asked how the brook trout got into this area. Response: They were introduced.

Pacific County:

Spokesperson(s): Bryan Harrison and Ron Craig

This lead entity submitted a list containing 7 projects requesting a total of \$1,505,211 in SRFB funds.

Supports approach 1. The Board needs to keep its commitment to the lead entities. Felt that the commitment was that if the lead entities kept science in the forefront of their decision-making then the Board would honor the local list. They are not satisfied with the process as it is currently.

Mr. Harrison and Mr. Craig described the hard work it took to rank and evaluate the best projects in the area and disagreed with what the Technical Panel found.

John Roskelley asked who is on the citizen committee. Ron Craig responded that the committee has a variety of members including oyster growers, fisheries biologists, farmers, gill-netters, WDFW staff, citizens at large, city representatives, and more.

John Roskelley also asked about acquisition in the area.

North Olympic Peninsula:

Spokesperson(s): John Cambalik and Dave King, WDFW

This lead entity submitted a list containing 12 projects requesting a total of \$3,526,165 in SRFB funds.

Mr. Cambalik expressed thanks to the SRFB for letting lead entities testify. Also special thanks to the Technical Panel, IAC staff, and most especially Jim Kramer for his good work in the last grant cycle. Fully supports approach 1 since it maintains integrity of lead entity list.

Dave King, WDFW, discussed Mosley Springs project. He does not agree with the Technical Panel comments or concerns.

The Board discussed the differences between the lead entity list and the Technical Panel ratings.

Nisqually River:

Spokesperson(s): David Troutt and Jeanette Dorner

This lead entity submitted a list containing 8 projects requesting a total of \$714,671 in SRFB funds.

This group feels there is a problem. Noted that this morning the Board discussed need for a regional approach. The Nisqually River group has been using a regional approach, but looking at the Technical Panel's rating this was not taken into consideration. Proposed an approach 3 for the Nisqually River Council projects; this option funds all eight projects.

Mason County CD:

Spokesperson(s): No one presented testimony.

This lead entity submitted a list containing 5 projects requesting a total of \$370,078 in SRFB funds.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board:

Spokesperson(s): Jeff Breckel

This lead entity submitted a list containing 18 projects requesting a total of \$5,186,391 in SRFB funds.

Mr. Breckel is comfortable with the whole process. Had a good technical process and time to work with applicants to get good projects. Appreciated the opportunity to meet with the Technical Panel before it ranked their projects, gave them a chance to develop projects better. Technical Panel review was very useful. In general concur with Technical Panel ratings. Likes approach 1.

Mr. Breckel highlighted several projects on the list that needed more explanation, or they would like funded.

Brenda McMurray asked if the Board should be concerned with the low certainty rating on project 5, Hemlock Dam Fish Passage Restoration. Mr. Breckel thinks the concerns will be addressed and that the certainty should be there but no guarantee that the project will be done.

John Roskelley was concerned with the proposed buffer width on project 7, Cedar Creek Watershed, asking if the buffer width could be increased? Jeff thought they would be agreeable to increasing the buffer width. John asked why the Board would fund a buffer width lower than the required critical area ordinance width. Steve Meyer stated that areas already in agriculture land status are exempt from critical area ordinances at this time.

The Technical Panel has requested conditioning for all the riparian buffer projects to meet a minimum checklist.

Klickitat County:

Spokesperson(s): Lori Zoller

This lead entity submitted a list containing 6 projects requesting a total of \$1,277,586 in SRFB funds.

Appreciated the suggested approaches, which helped her to see the need for more coordination and technical work. Technical Panel ratings pointed out the need for a stronger local technical review. They are integrating with the 2514 process and want to work with the NWPPC on the subbasin planning process. Supports approach 1. Number one project is definitely needed. Would like to see the funded projects be conditioned to increase certainty.

Jim Peters questioned project 4, Dillacort Canyon, since it includes grazing. Lori said there would be conditions on this project and that fencing would be provided to keep cattle out of the stream.

Kitsap County LE:

Spokesperson(s): Keith Folkerts, Jeff Davis, and Paul Dorn

This lead entity submitted a list containing 19 projects requesting a total of \$5,259,179 in SRFB funds.

Keith Folkerts thanked the Board for its efforts in salmon recovery. Supports approach 1. Although they appreciate the comments from approach 2, feels it would be detrimental to the citizens and local technical efforts. Brought 19 projects forward, have a limiting factors analysis in their area. Have other projects in the area that are being funded by different sources.

Gerry O'Keefe asked what momentum funding project 4, Salmonberry Creek Restoration, would give their group. Response: Would encourage local farmers; property owners upstream and down have already developed wetland ponds at both ends and this would link the two ponds. It could also influence nearby golf course to do restoration work.

Brenda McMurray asked about project 10, YMCA Camp Seymour Shoreline Marina Project, which was rated high benefit and high certainty by the Technical Panel but is not suggested for funding under approach 1. Keith said the local technical panel also ranked this project high but the citizen group felt this project needed to be developed more; they plan to tighten up the project, and bring it back to the Board next year.

John Roskelley inquired about the cost of the bridge project 1, Dogfish Creek Estuary Bridge, and relationship to project 13, Dogfish Creek Property Acquisition.

King County WRIA 9:

Spokesperson(s): Doug Osterman, Kirk Lakey, and Joe Stone

This lead entity submitted a list containing 5 projects requesting a total of \$1,672,000 in SRFB funds.

Appreciate the Technical Panel, Board and staff. Strongly support approach 1. Informed the Board that they used an eleven point technical process to review the projects in their area where the SRFB's Technical Panel only used a two tier criteria for rating.

Joe Stone, a local resident, gave a brief history of the Big Spring Creek site.

John Roskelley asked about the Big Spring Creek acquisition water rights. Response: Sponsor is talking to the property owner about the water rights.

King County WRIA 8:

Spokesperson(s): Jean White

This lead entity submitted a list containing 8 projects requesting a total of \$1,632,500 in SRFB funds.

Technical Panel, staff, and Board have taken on a big job and the process has been improving as we move along. WRIA 8 supports approach 1 with adjustments, would like the Board to fund either project 5, Rock Creek/Wetland 92 Protection, or project 8, Issaquah/Holder Creek Acquisition.

Island County:

Spokesperson(s): No one presented testimony.

This lead entity submitted a list containing 4 projects requesting a total of \$836,367 in SRFB funds.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council:

Spokesperson(s): Jay Watson

This lead entity submitted a list containing 19 projects requesting a total of \$3,676,287 in SRFB funds.

Supports approach 1. Would like to ask the Board to fund project 11, Chimacum Creek Restoration; project 12, Vance Creek Road Stabilization Project; and project 13, Nalley Slough Barrier Removal.

Mr. Watson had some concerns with the list, based on a lack of communication between the Technical Panel and the lead entity during project presentation.

John Roskelley inquired about project 6, HWY 101 Estuary Causeway Removal, concerning DOT's commitment to the project. Jerry Alb will evaluate this project tonight and report back tomorrow.

Grays Harbor County:

Spokesperson(s): Lee Hansmann and Jim Scott

This lead entity submitted a list containing 14 projects requesting a total of \$2,235,298 in SRFB funds.

Ms. Hansmann thanked the Technical Review Panel and SRFB staff for sharing their comments and giving assistance. Supports approach 1 since it closely reflects the lead entity ranking and was at the natural break in lead entity scoring.

Jim Scott, from WDFW and assisting the Chehalis Fisheries Task Force, testified concerning project #4, Chehalis Basin Watershed Assessment, which rated as a low benefit and low certainty. Encouraged use of EDT assessment tool here; SRFB needs to evaluate fish production benefits for each of the projects.

The Chair noted that there are some differences of opinion between scientists on the best assessment tools. The Board is not in the position to clear up this issue now. The state does need to agree with the assessment tools that will be used in the future for

project selection. The GSRO will be releasing its assessment report in the next month and this should give the Board a place to start.

Asotin CD:

Spokesperson(s): Brad Johnson and Steve Martin

This lead entity submitted a list containing 18 projects requesting a total of \$3,118,704 in SRFB funds.

Brad Johnson supported where the line was drawn in approach 1 since the lead entity group had drawn the same line.

Steve Martin reiterated what Brad said about the lead entity findings. Their group is also involved in the 2514 watershed process and a BPA process. Thanked the Board and expressed support for approach 1.

John Roskelley asked about buffer widths. Brad said that they are striving for 180 feet buffer width with a 50-foot minimum. One area will have a hard time getting the 50-foot minimum due to a rock wall.

Brenda McMurray asked about electro-fishing. Steve Martin said they use other methods when the fish are larger and the stream conditions warrant. When using electro-fishing techniques, policies and procedures developed by Fish and Wildlife are used.

**General Public Comments:**

*Gordon Congdon, Executive Director Chelan Douglas Land Trust:* He is supporting Upper Columbia Project #12, Entiat River Habitat acquisition. This project would rank near the top of the Upper Columbia list if not for the vote of one citizen member who had concerns with impacts of an acquisition of this size on the Entiat River Valley. Mr. Congdon has since talked to this landowner and the Entiat Valley Landowners Association and he believes the Land Trust has addressed many of their concerns. He read the closing comments of a letter from the Entiat Valley Landowners Association indicating renewed support of this project. If this parcel of land is not purchased, there is concern that a proposed bridge project will encourage development on the far side of the river.

*John Junell, Sequim-Dungeness Valley Tri-Irrigators:* Supporting North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity's project #9, Sequim Prairie Tri-Irrigation and how this project will get water back into the Dungeness River. Introduced Bob Montgomery.

*Bob Montgomery, Montgomery Water Group/Dungeness River Agricultural Water Users Association:* Department of Ecology hired his group to develop a list of water conservation projects to improve instream flows in the Dungeness River. They developed a large list; several projects have been funded by the SRFB. This particular project combines three elements: piping, constructing a re-regulation reservoir, and eliminates duplicative water system efforts. He was not involved in the actual

application process and thinks there may have been some miscommunication on the application. He is hoping to clear up some of this confusion and get the project funded.

Some questions were raised concerning water rights. Gerry O'Keefe will contact the watershed lead in that area and get answers to the questions.

*Joan Burlingame, Friends of Rock Creek:* Discussed the King County WRIA 8 Project #3, Rock Creek/ Ravensdale Retreat and need to fund this project.

*J. Roach, citizen advisor to Chehalis Basin Partnership:* Discussed the need for better data systems.

Recessed for the night at 6:25 p.m. to reconvene at 8:15 a.m. January 26.

## Day 2

---

### ***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
James Peters	Olympia
John Roskelley	Spokane
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Jeff Koenings	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Gerry O'Keefe	Designee, Department of Ecology

---

### **WAC ADOPTION PROCESS**

Director Johnson recapped the WAC adoption process, reporting that the final public hearing was held on January 24, 2001.

Director Johnson asked for Board questions. John Roskelley inquired about descriptions in the new sections concerning accounting requirements, eligible applicants, and leasing of property for 50 years. Ms. Johnson responded that these rules are the basic framework for administration of SRFB grants; the Board-adopted Manuals detail the particular grant cycle.

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt Resolution #2001-01 Administrative Rules for Chapter 420 WAC. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion. Board **approved** Resolution #2001-01.

Craig Partridge, the DNR Designee to the SRFB, introduced the new Commissioner of Public Lands, Doug Sutherland.

### **SECOND ROUND GRANT CYCLE - DECISIONS**

Jim Kramer reviewed the two different approaches to help the Board in deciding which approach to take when funding projects in this grant cycle.

Approach 1 uses a combination of a natural break in the lead entity list and the Technical Panel ratings in removing the low benefit/low certainty projects from the list. This approach funds \$31 million in projects.

Approach 2 uses the Technical Panel results in funding the projects the Technical Panel deemed as high or medium in benefit and high or medium in certainty. The approach funds \$26 million in projects.

Craig Partridge asked about the total amount available for funding of projects and what other activities might the Board want to fund separately. Response: Currently there is



about \$34 million available for funding projects and/or special activities (should the Board wish to fund them).

Steve Meyer recommended not funding any projects ranked 'low' in either the benefit or the certainty criteria.

The Chair suggested using approach 1, which was the overwhelming choice of the lead entity groups. The Board needs to honor the lead entity process keeping the science group in the review process. Suggested the Board proceed using approach 1, but allow exceptions where the Board members would like to add or remove a project.

Mr. Roskelley was impressed with the lead entity projects and the staff work to make it easy for the Board to go through the projects and understand where they are. On science, he feels the Board should be paying more attention to the Technical Panel's advice. Will go with approach 1, as the Chair suggested, but may suggest withdrawing some projects and possibly funding other projects farther down the list.

Brenda McMurray asked about some of the engineered logjam projects. Response: Staff will highlight them for the Board when appropriate.

Jeff Koenings will have a few projects that he will highlight.

Jerry Alb will be highlighting barrier removal projects.

Steve Meyer stressed not going below the funding lines.

The Chair suggested the Board proceed thru each lead entity request starting with 'A'.

#### Asotin:

Larry Cassidy **moved** approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-9 for \$1,017,416 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

#### Board Discussion:

Any projects that have been recommended for conditioning by the Technical Panel will have conditions put on the projects prior to the agreements being signed. On riparian buffers, staff will work with the project managers and other state agencies to develop a standard checklist to achieve the salmon benefits sought in the projects.

#### Vote on approach 1:

Unanimous **approval**: no amendments.

#### Grays Harbor:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-3 and 5-9 for \$1,234,125 in SRFB funds. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion.

#### Board Discussion:

Some clarifying questions were asked.

Vote on approach 1:

Unanimous **approval**: no amendments.

Hood Canal:

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-5, 7, 8, and 10 for \$2,166,247 in SRFB funds. (Project number 6 was withdrawn by the lead entity prior to motion.) Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

John Roskelley would also like to withdraw project number 4, East Jefferson County Forage Fish Study, due to its low certainty rating.

On projects with low certainty the Chair would like to make sure the staff review these projects closely and condition the agreements to ensure higher certainty. Need to make sure the nearshore studies are designed consistently in all the nearshore areas of the state.

Brenda McMurray noted that the local projects will assist in the larger study and suggests putting a placeholder on this project.

John Roskelley made a **motion** to withdraw project 4 from the consideration in this grant cycle.

Brenda McMurray **seconded** Mr. Roskelley's motion. Two for (McMurray and Roskelley) three against this amendment (Ruckelshaus, Peters, and Cassidy). **Motion failed.**

Larry Cassidy **moved** to fund this project with the condition that it conform with the broader nearshore study, answer uncertainty that exists, and be consistent with other nearshore studies. **Seconded** by Jim Peters. **Amendment approved.**

Jeff Koenings asked what the large nearshore study is. The Chair responded that WDFW along with other agencies like Ecology and NMFS are involved in developing a nearshore/saltwater study and this group will be coming before the Board for support in the future.

Vote on approach 1 as amended to include nearshore conditions included on project 4, East Jefferson County Forage Fish Study:

Unanimous **approval**: as amended.

Island County:

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-3 for \$681,367 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Brenda McMurray would also like to include project 4, Salmon Supporting Creek Inventories since it fits in with the rest of this lead entity's strategy. John Roskelley agreed. Mr. Roskelley would like to condition this to include the need to make sure they include nearshore.

All nearshore studies need to be conditioned to conform with other nearshore projects.

Brenda McMurray **moved** that approach 1 be amended to include project 4. **Seconded** by Jim Peters. **Amendment approved.**

Director Johnson suggested staff do a little more work on this project to see how it fits in with project 2, Island County Nearshore Habitat Assessment. There is a possibility that project 2 and 4 could be combined for better-cost effectiveness.

Vote on approach 1 including project 4 with conditions.  
Unanimous **approval**: as amended.

King County WRIA 8:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-4 for \$832,500 in SRFB funds. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

John Roskelley would like to include project 8, Issaquah/Holder Creek Acquisition, which rated high for both benefit and certainty by the Technical Panel.

The Chair is concerned with taking a project from the bottom of a list and funding it even though the Technical Panel rated it high.

Craig Partridge reminded the Board that the lead entity representative at yesterday's meeting asked the Board to consider including funding of either project 5 or 8.

John Roskelley **moved** to amend approach 1 to include project 8. Jim Peters **seconded**. Four voted for this amendment (Roskelley, McMurray, Cassidy, Peters) and one against (Ruckelshaus). **Amendment approved.**

Vote on approach 1 as amended to include project 8.  
Unanimous **approval**: as amended.

King County WRIA 9:

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-4 for \$1,572,000 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Brenda McMurray would like to condition project 3, Big Spring Creek Acquisition, to look more into water rights and costs.

John Roskelley asked about the process to restore a channel to historic flows. Director Koenings responded that restoring stream channels is done quite often and is a very successful process.

Brenda McMurray asked that more clarification on the water right issues and fair market value of this project be added as a caveat on this project.

Vote on approach 1 with caveat on project 3:  
Unanimous **approval**.

Kitsap County:

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-5 for \$1,958,050 in SRFB funds. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Jeff Koenings is growing more concerned about the coordination of nearshore assessments. Discussion was held concerning the nearshore assessments and possible options.

Jim Kramer reminded the Board that the recommendation of the staff was to coordinate a coordinated effort on nearshore issues.

Jim Peters asked Jerry Alb about the funding match for project 1, Dogfish Creek Estuary Bridge. Jerry Alb confirmed that the match is firm for this project. John Roskelley asked if there were other funding sources this project could tap into since the SRFB request is so expensive. Jerry Alb said there might be some options in the future but not at this time.

Brenda McMurray moved to add project 10, YMCA Camp Seymour Shoreline/Marina Project, due to the high technical rating, and cost benefit. The Chair expressed concern with jumping over projects especially when the lead entity plans to bring this project back in the next funding cycle. Other Board members agreed; this is not a project that needs to be done this year. Next cycle there may be other projects included in the list that will enhance this project. Brenda withdrew her motion.

Vote on approach 1 as presented.  
Unanimous **approval**.

Klickitat:

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-4 for \$492,385 in SRFB funds. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

John Roskelley would like to make sure project 4, Dillacort Canyon, includes fencing and would like to remove project 2, Upper Rattlesnake Creek Headwater Enhancement, due to low rating. Brenda McMurray concurred with removal of project 2. Chair asked if conditions could improve the certainty.

Jim Kramer told the Board that the Technical Panel didn't feel putting check dams in the streams would take care of the cause of the problem. Redesign may not help this project's certainty of success.

John Roskelley noted both project 2, Upper Rattlesnake Creek Headwater Enhancement, and project 3, Lower-Middle Rattlesnake Creek, are above the dam.

Larry Cassidy said there is a written agreement to remove the dam and these projects should go forward.

John Roskelley **moved** an amendment to remove projects 2 and 3 from the list. He would like to have the lead entity bring these projects back in a future cycle once the dam issue is clearer. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion. **Amendment approved.**

Vote on approach 1 as amended, to exclude projects 2 and 3, and funding projects 1 and 4 only:

Unanimous **approval**: as amended.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board:

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-11 and 13 for \$3,369,304 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Larry Cassidy asked about the differences between the Technical Panel document rating on project 7, Cedar Creek Watershed Riparian Project, which is High/ Medium with conditions, and the ratings on the approach summary document which are Medium / Medium with conditions. Rollie Geppert informed the Board that there had been a typo and that the project rating should be Medium/Medium with conditions.

Brenda McMurray commented that the lead entity's recommend project 5, Hemlock Dam Fish Passage Restoration, is already being funded by the Forest Service. Jeff Breckel , LCFRB, responded: LCFRB had some concerns about the obligation by the USFS to fund this project, but still presented it to the SRFB for funding. This has a local sponsor and support of local area. Although the Forest Service may be required to fund this project, funding by the SRFB would expedite the project. Larry Cassidy recommends funding of this project. Chair suggested approving this project conditionally.

The Board concurred to condition project 5 for investigation into possible funding by the Forest Service.

Ms. McMurray also requested project 13, Brooks Slough Habitat Restoration, be approved with conditioning to help increase the project's certainty.

The Chair reminded other Board members that for all projects with a low certainty rating or a MC note in the rating, conditions would be included prior to a SRFB grant agreement.

Vote on approach 1 with conditioning on projects 5 (funding) and 13 (dike removal and neighbor issues):

Unanimous **approval**: as conditioned.

Mason County:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-4 for \$327,578 in SRFB funds. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Jim Peters recused himself due to possible conflict of interest.

No further discussion.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:

Unanimous **approval**.

Nisqually:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1, 3-5, and 8 for \$479,880 in SRFB funds. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Jeff Koenings would like the Board to consider funding project 2, Grauwen Ohop Creek Acquisition, even though it has a low benefit and certainty rating by the Technical Panel. Jim Peters supports adding projects 2. Steve Meyer suggested honoring the Technical Panel's rating. He stated that to get a low rating, the full Panel had to be in concurrence. Brenda McMurray agrees with Steve. Craig Partridge thought that maybe the Technical Panel didn't understand the economic concerns in this area. Jim Kramer said the Panel wasn't sure that this location is the best area on the river for restoration efforts. Chair would be inclined to vote for this project with a conditional approval on it. Jim Peters feels this is an urgent project to fund.

Rollie Geppert reported staff recommendation to fund project 7, Muck Lake/Lacamas Creek Restoration. This project was unintentionally left off the approach 1 list and should have been recommended for funding.

Larry Cassidy moved an amendment to add project 2, with conditions added and brought back before the Board before funding, and adding project 7 with conditions on certainty.

John Roskelley asked to split this decision into two separate motions.

Larry Cassidy **moved** to add project 2, with conditions and being brought back before the Board before final funding. **Seconded** by John Roskelley. **Amendment approved**.

Larry Cassidy moved to add project 7 with conditions. Motion died for lack of a second.

Vote on approach 1 as amended to add project 2:  
Unanimous **approval**: as amended.

NOPL:

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1, 2, and 5-7 for \$2,045,957 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Jeff Koenings would like to add project 4, Mosley Springs Extension, since the lead entity testified that the Technical Panel was incorrect in its low benefit rating.

Gerry O'Keefe would like to add project 9, Sequim Prairie Tri-Irrigation, given Ecology's work in this area and the streamflow benefits it would provide.

Craig Partridge would like to add project 12, Clallam County Nearshore Assessment, consistent with previous condition to link with other nearshore assessments.

Brenda McMurray has concern with project 5, Morse Creek Restore Phase 1: Acquisition, and would like it removed or a high level of alert condition due to uncertainty rating and large price tag on this project.

Chair suggests three separate amendments and voting on them one at a time.  
Amendment to add project 4: **No motion to add was made.**

Amendment to add project 9: Motion made by John Roskelley. Seconded by Jim Peters. Voting for this add John Roskelley, Jim Peters, and Larry Cassidy. Against – Bill Ruckelshaus and Brenda McMurray. There was confusion on the project 9 amendment. Re-voted: (Ayes – Peters and Cassidy) (Nays - Roskelley, McMurray, and Ruckelshaus). **Motion failed.**

Amendment to add project 12. Jim Peters moved to add project 12. **Motion died** for lack of a second.

Vote on approach 1: as presented  
Unanimous **approval**.

Pacific County:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-5 for \$740,211 in SRFB funds. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Brenda would like to remove project 2, South Bend Mill Creek Restoration Project, for lack of benefit over the long-term and long-term benefit to the species. Chair suggested conditioning this project to alleviate the uncertainty. Appreciates Brenda's concern but thinks this problem could be solved with conditioning.

Vote on approach 1 with conditions added on project 2:  
Unanimous **approval**.

Pend Oreille:

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of project 1 for \$202,000 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

John Roskelley had a question for Jeff Koenings on project 2, Middle Branch Le Clerc Creek Bull Trout. Mr. Koenings said there is very little that can be done with bull trout restoration and that this is an excellent project. The Chair wonders if the Board is in position to fund this type of project and that the Board may want to look into a policy on this issue. Rollie Geppert said if the Board looks at project eligibility for this grant cycle, this project would be eligible. This is not a fish harvest issue but a fish management issue.

John Roskelley **moved** to add project 2. Jim Peters **seconded**. Approved by Roskelley, Peters, and Cassidy. Opposed by McMurray and Ruckelshaus.  
**Amendment to add project 2 passed.**

Vote on approach 1 as amended to include project 2:  
Approved **4-1**. (Voting for: Ruckelshaus, Roskelley, Peters, and Cassidy. Voting against: McMurray.)

Pierce County:

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1, 2, and 6-9 for \$1,324,270 in SRFB funds. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Jerry Alb asked to add project 3, Birch Street Barrier Removal, due to public support and financial backing by the community.

Brenda McMurray moved to add project 3. John Roskelley seconded the motion.  
**Amendment to add project 3 passed.** (Voting for McMurray, Roskelley, Cassidy, and Peters. Voting against Ruckelshaus.)

Vote on approach 1 as amended to add project 3.  
Unanimous **approval**.

Quinault:

John Roskelley **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1 and 2 for \$85,500 in SRFB funds. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:  
Unanimous **approval**.



### Upper Columbia

Jim Peters **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-17 for \$4,857,795 in SRFB funds. Larry Cassidy **seconded** the motion.

### Board Discussion:

Brenda moved to remove project 4, Environmental Assessment of Entiat Sub-basin, and project 16, Beaver Creek Fish Passage Barrier. John Roskelley seconded this motion. Chair said this is another case where the project has low certainty that will be conditioned to bring up the certainty. Brenda replied that in the case of project 4, the Panel has stated that the information is already available and that an EDT assessment may not be necessary. The Chair discussed the differences in opinions on whether EDT assessments are warranted or not.

Ms. McMurray expressed concern with project 16, namely barriers above and below this project. Jerry Alb encouraged the Board to keep project 16 in the project list since DOT will be taking out barriers both above and below this barrier and this project may help with getting other projects completed sooner. Jeff Koenings recommended keeping project 16 due to his feeling the Board should err towards the lead entity's local knowledge and that the low certainty issue will be taken care of with conditioning.

Mr. Roskelley asked Hilary Lyman to re-explain project 19, Property Acquisition in Salmon Creek, and the need to do this project.

Ms. Lyman discussed the project aspects explaining match amount and benefit to salmon.

Brenda McMurray withdrew her request to remove project 4 and project 16 and John Roskelley withdrew his second.

John Roskelley moved add project 19 and Jim Peters seconded the motion. **Vote on adding project 19 failed.** (Aye – Roskelley and Peters, Nay- McMurray, Cassidy, and Ruckelshaus)

Vote on approach 1 as presented:  
Unanimous **approval**.

### San Juan:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of project 1 for \$165,757 in SRFB funds. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:  
Unanimous **approval**.

### Selah/Yakima/Yakama Nation:

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-5 for \$563,616 in SRFB funds. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Brenda recused herself since she has connection with several projects.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:

Unanimous **approval**.

Skagit:

Jim Peters **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-5, 7-18, 20, 21, and 23 for \$2,719,710 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Brenda McMurray would like to condition project 14, Neff Acquisition and Restoration. Chair doesn't think a separate vote needs to be taken to condition this project; assume conditioning is part of the vote as a whole.

John Roskelley expressed concern with cost for project 13, Daniels Acquisition and Restoration. Chair asked if he would like to add a condition to the project. Mr. Roskelley is not sure what condition to put on this project. Director Johnson stated that all acquisitions need to go through an appraisal process and this may address any concerns.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:

Unanimous **approval**.

Snohomish County:

Larry Cassidy **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-9, 11 and 12 for \$2,168,500 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Jim Kramer pointed out that one of the two Engineered Log Jam projects is on the Snohomish County list and the other is on the Whatcom list.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:

Unanimous **approval**.

Thurston:

Brenda McMurray **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1 and 2 for \$259,300 in SRFB funds. John Roskelley **seconded** the motion.

Vote on approach 1 as presented:

Unanimous **approval**.

Whatcom County:

Jim Peters **moved** to adopt approach 1 which includes funding of projects 1-5 for \$2,009,731 in SRFB funds. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion.

Board Discussion:

Gerry O'Keefe would like the Board to look at project 11, Instream Flow Assessment WRIA 1, since it would bring together water issues with salmon recovery issues.

Chair pointed out that this project is the last project on the lead entity list, and was rated low by the Technical Panel.

Brenda McMurray is concerned with the high cost of this project and low certainty. Would like to have staff work with the lead entity group to represent this project in the next grant cycle. She would also like project 4, Chinook Spawning – Incubation Assessment, to be conditioned.

Vote on approach 1 as presented with conditions on projects 3, 4, and 5:  
Unanimous **approval**.

This concludes the Board's grant award session. It was noted that the decisions today resulted in \$31.8 million committed to 147 projects.

Brenda McMurray noted how much smoother this round went and thanked the lead entities for their willingness to give feedback on the SRFB process and help to make this work better.

Bill Ruckelshaus also noted how much improved the process was in this grant round, although still not perfect. The success of the Board depends very much on the success of the lead entities. The Chair hopes the lead entities see the Board as a partner in salmon recovery efforts.

John Roskelley would like to see more details on the monitoring efforts. Chair would like to have monitoring issues placed on a future agenda.

## **NEXT STEPS**

Director Johnson highlighted next steps:

- Staff will proceed to place projects under contract. For the conditioned projects, Chair will create a working subcommittee to assist staff in developing conditions for riparian and nearshore/estuarine projects.
- Since this grant cycle includes both state and federal funds, Laura Johnson requested the Board give staff authority to decide which type money goes to each project.
- Staff will work on a number of policy issues (monitoring, ELJ, nearshore, etc.) and bring recommendations back to the Board.
- Proposed Third Round grant cycle materials need to be out by July 1, so the Board's spring agendas will be fairly busy to meet the grant cycle.

- There will be some sort of debriefing from this cycle so we can start working on the Third Round.
- Successful applicant workshops are scheduled for March. Letters will go to the successful applicants in the next week.
- Several projects have closed and progress is being made on projects from earlier grant cycles.

The Chair expressed thanks to staff for all their hard work and to the non-voting members of the Board for their active participation.

### **PARTNER AGENCY REPORTS**

Steve Meyer noted that the Board had a copy of the Governor's water strategy; he wanted to bring that to the Board's attention.

Jerry Alb wanted to thank the Board in including the non-voting members into the process. Transportation is working with lead entity groups to find mitigation projects.

Gerry O'Keefe thanked Steve Meyer for bringing the Governor's water strategy to the Board.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

---

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

---

Date

Future Meetings:     March 1-2, 2001 – Olympia, 172 NRB  
                             April 5-6, 2001 – Olympia, 172 NRB  
                             May 23-24, 2001 – Pasco, DoubleTree